

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this Department showed the following results:

Solids by refractometer (per cent)	88.09
Nonsugar solids (per cent)	6.71
Sucrose, Clerget (per cent).....	73.06
Reducing sugars as invert before inversion (per cent).....	8.32
Commercial glucose (factor 163) (per cent).....	8.59
Polarizations—	
Direct at 25° C. (°V.)	+88.1
Invert at 25° C. (°V.)	— 7.0
Invert at 87° C. (°V.)	+14.0
Ash (per cent).....	.44
Ash, soluble in water (per cent).....	.41
Ash, insoluble in water (per cent).....	.03
Alkalinity soluble ash (cc N/10 acid per 100 grams)	44.0
Lead precipitate (Winton number).....	.61
Preservatives	None.

	Weight.		Shortage. Per cent.
	Pound.	Ounces.	
1st can.....	1	6.15	7.71
2d can.....	1	6.55	6.04
3d can.....	1	5.58	10.08
Average.....	1	6.09	7.94

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, a product prepared in part from glucose, had been mixed and packed with the article of food so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and in that a product prepared in part from glucose had been substituted wholly or in part for the sugar butter prepared from cane sugar, which the article, according to the labels thereon contained, purported to have been. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the product was labeled as set forth above and thereby said defendant held out and represented to purchasers and consumers thereof that the article was a superior brand of cream sugar butter and was a product prepared from cane sugar without the use of glucose, whereas, in truth and in fact, the same consisted of a mixture prepared in part from glucose; and further that the same and each of the cans weighed $1\frac{1}{2}$ pounds or more net weight, whereas, in truth and in fact, the same and each of them weighed less than $1\frac{1}{2}$ pounds, and by reason of the premises hereinbefore set forth, the product and each can thereof was misbranded, in that the said words thereon contained were false and misleading and calculated to deceive and mislead the purchasers and consumers thereof, in that they conveyed the impression and belief to them that the product was a sugar butter prepared without the use of glucose, whereas, in truth and in fact, said glucose formed a substantial part of the article of food; and further conveyed the impression that the same was $1\frac{1}{2}$ pounds in weight, whereas, in truth and in fact, the same weighed less than that amount.

On December 8, 1913, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 18, 1914.

2879. Adulteration and misbranding of sweet nubbins pickles. U. S. v. Amazon Vinegar & Pickling Works. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10 and costs. (F. & D. No. 4236. I. S. No. 17368-d.)

On October 2, 1912, the United States Attorney for the Southern District of Iowa, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Amazon Vinegar & Pickling

Works, a corporation, Davenport, Iowa, alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on October 26, 1911, from the State of Iowa into the State of Illinois, of a quantity of so-called sweet nubbins pickles which were adulterated and misbranded. The product was labeled: "Amazon Vinegar and Pickling Works Davenport Iowa. Trade Mark. Guaranteed by Amazon Vinegar & Pickling Works under the Food and Drugs Act, June 30, 1906. Serial No. 8819. Warranted to comply with all state food laws. Sweet Nubbins Pickles."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this Department showed the following results: Sodium benzoate by weight, 0.154 per cent; sodium benzoate by titration, 0.13 per cent. Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that a product, to wit, pickles, containing benzoate of soda, an artificial preservative, had been mixed and packed with the article so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and in that said product had been substituted wholly or in part for the pickles prepared without an artificial preservative, which the article purported to be. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement "Pickles," without any qualifying statement as to the artificial preservative present, was false and misleading, as it conveyed the impression that the product was pickles prepared without the use of such artificial preservative, whereas in fact the same had been prepared with and contained a quantity of artificial preservative. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the product was labeled and branded so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that the article was pickles preserved without the use of an artificial preservative, whereas the same was prepared with and contained a quantity of benzoate of soda, an artificial preservative, the presence of which was not declared on the label.

On April 25, 1913, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information and the court imposed a fine of \$10 and costs.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 18, 1914.*

